UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,244	06/06/2006	Fernando Incertis Carro	FR920040018US1	4148

30449   7590   10/02/2008

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE
SUITE 302
LATHAM, NY 12110

EXAMINER
SU, SARAH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/596,244	CARRO, FERNANDO INCERTIS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sarah Su	2131

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 June 2006_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _13-32_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _13-32_ is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) _21,22,31 and 32_ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _06 June 2006_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
      3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _6/6/06_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Preliminary Amendment, received on 6 June 2006, has been entered into record.

In this amendment, claims 1-12 have been cancelled, and claims 13-32 have been

added.

2.   Claims 13-32 are presented for examination.

Priority

3.   The claim for priority from PCT/EP05/50925 filed on 2 March 2005 is duly noted.

4.   Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which

papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

5.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because "A method for processing a

file having an existing filename" (line 1) is not a complete sentence. Correction is

required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

6.   Claims 21-22 and 31-32 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of

improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous

claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the

claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims

21 and 31 recite a computer readable medium comprising instructions to perform the

method of claims 13 and 23, respectively. Claims 22 and 32 recite a system comprising

a computer readable medium comprising instructions to perform the method of claims

13 and 23, respectively, and means for executing these instructions. These limitations

do not further limit claims 13 and 23.

7.   Claims 17, 24, 27-28 are objected to because of the following informalities:

    a.   In claim 17, line 2: "the owner" lacks antecedent basis;

    b.   In claim 24, line 1: "the owner" lacks antecedent basis;

    c.   In claim 27, line 2: "disposed between between a" should read –disposed

between a–;

    d.   In claim 28, line 2: "the owner" lacks antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 13, 15, 17-26, 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Murakawa (US 2005/0005097 A1) and in view of Bhaskaran et al.

(US 2005/0188203 A1 and Bhaskaran hereinafter).

As to claim 13, Murakawa discloses a system and method for communications in public

key infrastructure, the system and method having:

signing the file with the generated digital signature (0005, lines 22-

23);

receiving, from a certification authority (CA) (i.e. device) **who issued a**

digital certificate, a private key associated with the digital certificate and a

certificate address (i.e. list of certificates) **from which the digital certificate**

may be accessed (0031, lines 1-3, 7-10);

generating a digital signature based on the file and the received

private key, said digital certificate comprising a public key associated with

the private key such that the generated digital signature can be verified

through use of the public key (0005, lines 21-22, 24-28).

Murakawa does not disclose:

encoding the received certificate address to generate an encoded

address;

merging the existing filename and the encoded address to generate a

new filename;

renaming the file with the new filename.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the teachings disclosed by Murakawa, as evidenced by Bhaskaran.

Bhaskaran discloses a system and method for packaging information with digitally

signed software, the system and method having:

encoding the received certificate address (i.e. dynamic data) **to**

generate an encoded address (0017, lines 10-11);

merging the existing filename and the encoded address to generate a

new filename (0014, lines 13-16);

renaming the file with the new filename (0014, lines 13-16).

Given the teaching of Bhaskaran, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

modifying the teachings of Murakawa with the teachings of Bhaskaran by encoding the

certificate address into a filename. Bhaskaran recites motivation by disclosing that

encoding information into a filename is an efficient way to add information to a software

package without destroying the authentication or digital signature (0005, lines 1-3). It is

obvious that the teachings of Bhaskaran would have improved the teachings of

Bhaskaran by encoding information into a filename in order to add information to the file

without destroying authentication information within the file.

As to claim 23, Murakawa discloses:

decoding the extracted encoded address to generate a certificate

address from which a digital certificate may be accessed, said digital

certificate comprising a public key associated with the private key (0031,

lines 10-14; 0042, lines 6-8), **said digital signature being verifiable through**

use of the public key (0042, lines 19-22);

accessing the digital certificate from the generated certificate

address (0042, lines 6-8);

extracting the public key from the accessed digital certificate (0005,

lines 25-27);

verifying the digital signature by executing an authentication

algorithm in conjunction with the extracted public key (0037, lines 1-2; 0038,

lines 1-2; 0039, lines 1-4).

Murakawa does not disclose:

extracting the encoded address from the filename.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the teachings disclosed by Murakawa, as evidenced by Bhaskaran.

Bhaskaran discloses:

extracting the encoded address from the filename (0015, lines 15-17).

Given the teaching of Bhaskaran, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

modifying the teachings of Murakawa with the teachings of Bhaskaran by extracting an

address from the filename. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to

claim 13 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Bhaskaran to the teachings of

Murakawa.

As to claims 15 and 26, Murakawa does not disclose:

wherein the encoded address is denoted as A, wherein the existing

filename is structured as F.E such that F and E respectively represent a

> **first and second sequence of characters, and wherein the new filename is**
>
> **structured as F(A).E.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Murakawa, as evidenced by Bhaskaran. Bhaskaran discloses:

> **wherein the encoded address** (i.e. dynamic data) **is denoted as A** (i.e.
>
> y)**, wherein the existing filename is structured as F.E such that F and E**
>
> **respectively represent a first and second sequence of characters, and**
>
> **wherein the new filename is structured as F(A).E** (0014, lines 13-16)**.** The
>
> examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the
>
> art to substitute parentheses for an underscore because they are both types of
>
> syntax.

Given the teaching of Bhaskaran, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Murakawa with the teachings of Bhaskaran by encoding an address into a filename by merging characters. Bhaskaran recites motivation by disclosing that merging a filename by combining characters allows it to be more user friendly so that a user can understand it (0017, lines 50-53). It is obvious that the teachings of Bhaskaran would have improved the teachings of Murakawa by encoding an address into a filename by merging characters in order to make the new filename user friendly.

As to claims 17 and 28, Murakawa does not disclose:

> **sending the renamed file from the owner of the digital certificate to a**
>
> **user.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the teachings disclosed by Murakawa, as evidenced by Bhaskaran.

Bhaskaran discloses:

> **sending the renamed** (i.e. wrapped) **file from the owner** (i.e. distributor)
>
> **of the digital certificate to a user** (0019, lines 10-12).

Given the teaching of Bhaskaran, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

modifying the teachings of Murakawa with the teachings of Bhaskaran by sending a

renamed file. Bhaskaran recites motivation by disclosing that wrapping a filename with

another file can help add labels of distributor specific information such as inventory

(0019, lines 1-5). It is obvious that the teachings of Bhaskaran would have improved

the teachings of Murakawa by using a renamed file in order to add label functionality

that would aid a distributor such as inventory information.

As to claims 18 and 29, Murakawa does not disclose:

> **wherein the encoded address is compressed relative to the**
>
> **certificate address**.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the teachings disclosed by Murakawa, as evidenced by Bhaskaran.

Bhaskaran discloses:

> **wherein the encoded address is compressed relative to the**
>
> **certificate address** (0017, lines 24-26).

Given the teaching of Bhaskaran, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

modifying the teachings of Murakawa with the teachings of Bhaskaran by compressing

an address. Bhaskaran recites motivation by disclosing that using compressed data will

prevent problems with computers that cannot handle long filenames (0017, lines 26-29).

It is obvious that the teachings of Bhaskaran would have improved the teachings of

Murakawa by using compressed addresses in order to prevent problems with

computers that can only handle filenames of limited size.

As to claims 19 and 25, Murakawa discloses:

> **wherein the certificate address is an address** (i.e. path information) **of**
>
> **a server of the certification authority such that the digital certificate is**
>
> **stored in the server** (0029, lines 14-15; 0041, lines 7-9).

As to claim 20, Murakawa discloses:

> **prior to said receiving, sending a request to the certification**
>
> **authority to issue the digital certificate** (0005, lines 15-16).

As to claims 21, 22, 31, and 32, Murakawa discloses:

> **wherein the instructions are adapted to perform the method of claim**
>
> **13** (Figure 2).

As to claim 24, Murakawa discloses:

> **wherein the digital certificate indicates the owner of the digital**
>
> **certificate, and wherein the method further comprises checking the**
>
> **accessed digital certificate to determine the owner of the digital certificate**
>
> (0034, lines 6-10; 0040, lines 3-7).

As to claim 30, Murakawa discloses:

> **wherein the digital certificate identifies the authentication algorithm**
>
> (0040, lines 3-7).

10.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of

Helpfile of Version 2.0 of MP3 Tag Clinic (XP-002334789 and Helpfile hereinafter).

As to claim 14, Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran does not disclose:

> **wherein said renaming is performed by a file system, wherein said**
>
> **encoding comprises replacing predetermined characters in the address**
>
> **with associated replacement characters, and wherein the predetermined**
>
> **characters are forbidden by the file system from being used in the new**
>
> **filename.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the teachings disclosed by Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran, as

evidenced by Helpfile.

Helpfile discloses a method of naming MP3 files, the method having:

wherein said renaming is performed by a file system, wherein said

encoding comprises replacing predetermined characters in the address

with associated replacement characters, and wherein the predetermined

characters are forbidden by the file system from being used in the new

filename (page 8, lines 4-5, 7-9).

Given the teaching of Helpfile, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying

the teachings of Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran with the teachings of Helpfile by

replacing forbidden characters with predetermined characters. Helpfile recites

motivation by disclosing that Windows does not allow some text characters to exist in a

filename and attempting to use these characters prevents a file from being renamed

(page 8, lines 4, 6-7). It is obvious that the teachings of Helpfile would have improved

the teachings of Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran by replacing certain characters with

predetermined characters in order to allow for filename changes even if an illegal

character is input as part of the filename.

11.   Claims 16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view

of DiPierro (US 2003/0088783 A1).

As to claims 16 and 27, Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran does not disclose:

wherein the file comprises a document, wherein said signing the file

comprises appending the generated digital signature to the file such that

the generated digital signature is disposed between a beginning tag and an

ending tag at the beginning of the file before the document.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the teachings disclosed by Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran, as

evidenced by DiPierro.

DiPierro discloses a system and method for secure computing, the system and method

having:

wherein the file comprises a document, wherein said signing the file

comprises appending the generated digital signature to the file such that

the generated digital signature is disposed between a beginning tag and an

ending tag at the beginning of the file before the document (0039, lines 2-3).

Given the teaching of DiPierro, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying

the teachings of Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran with the teachings of DiPierro by

appending the signature in the header of a file. DiPierro recites motivation by disclosing

that a signature is placed within the file structure, generally in the header (0041, lines 3-

6) so that it can be easily located after decryption. It is obvious that the teachings of

DiPierro would have improved the teachings of Murakawa in view of Bhaskaran by

placing a signature in a header in order to allow for easier access after decryption.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Su whose telephone number is (571) 270-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sarah Su/
Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Christopher A. Revak/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131